

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of September 17, 2010, claims 1, 20, 37 and 56-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,975,425 (“Abe et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796,401 (“Winer”). In addition, claims 1-10, 14-28, 32-46 and 50-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Abe et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,841,435 (“Dauerer et al.”).

In response, Applicant has canceled claims 56-58 and has amended the independent claims 1, 20 and 37 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. In view of the amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims 1-10, 14-28, 32-46, 50-55 and 59-67 are now in condition for allowance.

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 20 and 37

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites the limitation of “*said geometric object being user-manipulable with respect to the size of said geometric object and the position of said geometric object displayed on said display device so that said area of said displayed device to be printed can be changed,*” which is not disclosed in the cited references of Abe et al., Winer and Dauerer et al. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of these cited references. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 20 and 37, which recite similar limitations as those of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, these amended independent claims 20 and 37 are also not obvious in view of the cited references. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claims 20 and 37 be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-10, 14-19, 21-28, 32-36, 38-46, 50-55 and 59-67

Each of the dependent claims 2-10, 14-19, 21-28, 32-36, 38-46, 50-55 and 59-67 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1, 20 and 37. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that, in any future Office Action, the alleged teaching of claimed elements **be specified by particular reference numbers of corresponding elements in the cited references so that the dependent claim rejections can be better addressed**. As an example, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner identify the element in Figs. 8-10, 13-15, 22-23 and 25 of Abe et al. that has been equated to the claimed “*geometric object*” recited in the amended independent claims 1, 20 and 37. As another example, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner identify the element in Figs. 3, 13 and 22-30 of Abe et al. that has been equated to the claimed “*canvas object*” recited in the previous independent claims 1, 20, 37 and 56-58, which is now recited in the new dependent claims 59, 62 and 65, for example.

Applicant respectfully requests a notice of allowance in view of the claim amendments and the remarks made herein.

Respectfully submitted,
Denny Jaeger

Date: March 17, 2010

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300